1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN		
2	SOUTHERN DIVISION		
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)		
4	Plaintiff,)		
5	-vs-) Criminal Case No.		
6	JONATHAN WOODS, 5:19-cr-20008-JEL		
7) Defendant.)		
8			
9	SENTENCE		
10	BEFORE THE HONORABLE JUDITH E. LEVY UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE		
11	Ann Arbor, Michigan - Friday, January 10, 2020		
12	APPEARANCES:		
13			
	FOR THE GOVERNMENT: BLAKE HATLEM, ESQ. United States Attorney's Office		
14	211 W. Fort Street, Suite 2001 Detroit, Michigan 48226		
15	(313) 226-9100		
16	FOR THE DEFENDANT: NATASHA D. WEBSTER, ESQ. Federal Defender Office		
17	613 Abbott, 5th Floor Detroit, Michigan 48226		
18	(313) 967-5542		
19			
20			
21	REPORTED BY: Darlene K. May, CSR, RPR, CRR, RMR		
22	231 W. Lafayette Boulevard Detroit, Michigan 48226		
23	(313) 234-2605		
24	(Proceedings reported by mechanical stenography)		
25	(Transcript produced by computer)		

1	 	ABLE OF CONTENTS
2		
3	WITNESSES:	
4	None	
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10	EXHIBITS:	
11	None	
12		
13		
14		
15 16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
212223		
24		
25		

```
Friday, January 10, 2020
 1
              11:06 a.m.
 2
 3
              All rise. The United States District Court is now in
 4
    session. The Honorable Judith E. Levy presiding.
 5
              The court calls case number 19-20008. The United
 6
    States of America versus Jonathan Woods.
 7
              Please be seated.
 8
 9
              Counsel, put your appearances on the record.
              MR. HATLEM: Good morning, Your Honor. Blake Hatlem
10
11
    on behalf of the United States.
12
              THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Hatlem. And thank you
    for standing in. I understand Mr. Haugabook had a conflict
13
    today.
14
              MR. HATLEM: That's correct, Your Honor.
15
16
              THE COURT: Okay. And I hope he's doing all right.
              MR. HATLEM: I hope so as well.
17
              THE COURT: Okay. Would you convey that to him for
18
    me?
19
20
              MR. HATLEM: I absolutely will.
21
              THE COURT: Thank you.
              MS. WEBSTER: Good morning, Your Honor. Natasha
22
    Webster on behalf of Mr. Woods.
23
2.4
              THE COURT: Hi, Ms. Webster.
25
              Welcome back, Mr. Woods. Please be seated.
```

2.4

THE COURT: This is the date and time that was set aside for sentencing in this case, United States of America versus Jonathan Woods.

And Mr. Woods as you remember, you pled guilty to Counts One through Four and those charged you with wire fraud. And you also pled guilty to Count Five in the indictment, which is possession of 15 or more unauthorized access devices, and you did so with a Rule 11 Plea Agreement.

At the time of your hearing, I accepted your plea of guilty and you were adjudged guilty of those offenses. Do you wish to maintain that plea?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: Okay. And at the time of your plea hearing, you were represented by Ms. Webster and then we were back here with a violation of the terms of your pretrial release and Ms. Webster was here with you then and, of course, she's here today.

Have you had any problems with your relationship with your lawyer that you think I should be aware of?

THE DEFENDANT: No, ma'am.

THE COURT: Okay. And again, I didn't anticipate that you would have -- the reason I ask that is you have a Sixth Amendment constitutional right to the effective assistance of a lawyer and it's my duty to safeguard that right. So I always ask that question.

```
So we'll now proceed with the sentencing hearing.
 1
    I've had an opportunity to review the presentence report that
 2
    was actually prepared on December 1st and then revised on
 3
    January 2nd of 2020.
 4
              Mr. Hatlem, is that the report you're working from?
 5
              MR. HATLEM: Yes, Your Honor.
 6
 7
              THE COURT: Does the government have any corrections,
 8
    changes, deletions?
 9
              MR. HATLEM: We do not.
              THE COURT: Okay. And Ms. Webster, that's the report
10
11
    you're working from as well?
              MS. WEBSTER: Yes, Your Honor.
12
              THE COURT: Did you have an opportunity to share the
13
    contents with your client?
14
              MS. WEBSTER: I did, Your Honor.
15
              THE COURT: Good. And then there are a number of
16
    objections that you've filed. I think one of them was
17
    resolved. But have any of the other objections been resolved
18
    or explained to you and your client's satisfaction?
19
20
              MS. WEBSTER: Yes, Your Honor. We -- our first
21
    objection, according to the addendum to the presentence report,
22
    we are withdrawing.
23
              THE COURT: Okay.
              MS. WEBSTER: That speaks to the use of the word
24
    "goat."
25
```

1 THE COURT: Exactly. MS. WEBSTER: We're withdrawing that objection. 2 THE COURT: The second objection goes to your client 3 objecting to the sentence in the report indicating that he had 4 posted firearms on social media. And Mr. Haugabook -- or did 5 you prepare the sentencing memo? 6 7 MR. HATLEM: I did not. It was Mr. Haugabook. 8 THE COURT: He provided me a picture of an image from the internet with cash with Mr. Woods with a firearm. 9 10 MS. WEBSTER: Yes, Your Honor. And Mr. Woods explains 11 to me that that is a replica. That is not a -- he says it's a 12 BB gun. It's not a real firearm. I would just note that I have seen replicas that are 13 very convincing but I haven't seen any evidence, for example, 14 of a serial number or anything making it an authentic or a 15 16 firearm as defined under the statute or guidelines. And it doesn't have a bearing on the guidelines, but Mr. Woods wants 17 the Court to know that it was not real. 18 I'm not an expert in firearms whatsoever. 19 THE COURT: 20 Mr. Hatlem, I'm looking at Page ID 122 in the 21 government's sentencing memorandum. MR. HATLEM: Forgive me. When you say page --22 23 The filing, page nine. THE COURT: MR. HATLEM: Oh, thank you. Yes, Your Honor. 2.4

also another image on page 13 of our guideline where he appears

25

```
to be holding another gun.
              THE COURT: Oh. That's -- I thought that was a
 2
 3
    telephone. Okay. Oh, yes, you're right.
              Mr. Woods, are those weapons that are depicted on page
 4
    13 replicas?
 5
              MS. WEBSTER: One moment, please, Your Honor.
 6
 7
              MR. HATLEM: Your Honor, I know the pictures are not
 8
    as clear. Is the Court aware there are actually what appears
 9
    to be two guns in one picture?
              THE COURT: Exactly.
10
11
              MR. HATLEM: I didn't actually catch that myself the
    first time.
12
              THE COURT: I don't have very good eyes. But I see
13
    one in Mr. Woods' pants pocket or something on the left-hand
14
    side on page 13 as well as something in his hands.
15
16
              MR. HATLEM: If I can address that while they're ...
              THE COURT: Well, I want to make sure they can consult
17
    with one another and also hear you.
18
          (Pause.)
19
20
              MS. WEBSTER: Your Honor, we've consulted. Upon
21
    showing Mr. Woods the photo on page 13 on the left ...
              THE COURT: Yeah.
22
23
              MS. WEBSTER: We will withdraw the objection.
              THE COURT: Okay. Now, is objection number three
2.4
25
    regarding the inclusion of the reference to a credit card
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

skimmer, are you still pursuing that? MS. WEBSTER: Your Honor, that is an objection. Because Mr. Woods maintains that this language in the text messages that this was derived from was, basically, posturing. That it was meant to make him look more credible with respect to credit card fraud than in actuality. THE COURT: That's the way I understood it, too. Which is why I didn't exactly understand the objection because -- let me go to paragraph 13. The way I understood it is that Mr. Woods was puffing, so to speak, about his capacity to do a great deal of fraud. And he wanted people to think he was personally getting the individuals' identities himself with a skimmer when, in fact, he went on the dark web and just bought them. MS. WEBSTER: Yes, Your Honor. So as long as the Court -- I think my client's concern is that the Court understands him as portraying this and not actually having one. I think that's kind of where the sticking point is. THE COURT: It says, "Woods portrayed himself

THE COURT: It says, "Woods portrayed himself obtaining the PII, the personal identifying information, from skimmers he left at gas stations that police departments supposedly seized."

See, I never thought for a minute he did that.

MS. WEBSTER: Okay. Your Honor, in light of the Court's commentary, we'll withdraw that objection.

THE COURT: Okay. 1 2 Is the loss amount still in controversy? MS. WEBSTER: It is not, Your Honor. 3 THE COURT: I didn't think so from your sentencing 4 5 memo. And number five is resolved, I think. 6 7 MS. WEBSTER: That's correct. That's correct. 8 And number six, we are withdrawing. I was able to review the history of the testing and we addressed that with 9 10 the Court last time in December. So we're moving on, Your 11 Honor. 12 THE COURT: Okay, good. Thank you. Well, as a result of what we have done so far, 13 Okay. I will accept the plea agreement itself. And based upon the 14 information in the presentence report as well as having 15 16 reviewed the sentencing memos, the guidelines in this case, Mr. Woods, I'm required to set forth what your sentencing 17 quidelines are. Your offense level is considered a 16. That 18 measures the seriousness of these offenses. 19 20 And your criminal history category is a two. And that 21 means that the applicable sentencing guidelines are 24 to 30 months. And that was what was estimated in your plea 22 23 agreement. 2.4 I'm aware that the guidelines are advisory and that I 25 have the authority to either depart or vary upward or downward

for reasons that I would set forth on the record. 2 I also want to mention that the presentence report was prepared by Courtney Turner, but Jennifer Danish is here in his 3 place because he's unavailable. I did have a chance to meet 4 with Mr. Turner by telephone earlier this week and also to meet 5 with Ms. Danish to review the contents of the report. 6 7 PRETRIAL SERVICES REPRESENTATIVE: Your Honor, it's 8 Courtney Wilson. 9 THE COURT: Courtney Wilson, not Turner. Good. 10 you. 11 So I will now call upon the government to address the 12 Court on the sentence that you believe is appropriate here and then Ms. Webster. 13 And then, Mr. Woods, after that, I'll turn to you and 14 you'll have an opportunity to speak on your own behalf, if you 15 16 want to. THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am. 17 MR. HATLEM: Should I use the lectern? 18 THE COURT: I think that might be easier. 19 20 should mention, which I think is already evident, that I have 21 read the sentencing memos that were submitted. MR. HATLEM: Thank you, Your Honor. May I begin? 22 23 THE COURT: Yes. MR. HATLEM: Your Honor, I'd like to begin by sort of 2.4 25 addressing what I think is maybe somewhat sidelined in this

case and which is verified is that there were actually real victims that were part of what we're calling the starter pack.

THE COURT: Okay.

2.4

MR. HATLEM: I talked with my agent this morning because that was one of the issues. As the Court is aware, I have recently been assigned to this case, but I've immersed myself in it in the last 36 to 48 hours. I've spent pretty much the majority of that time, as much as I could, learning about the case. And that was one of the first questions I had is, did these people actually exist? Were there 16 actual people associated with that?

While they, apparently, were or have not themselves been victims of the crime, it was their personal identification information which was being disseminated out. And I think that that's important for the Court to know. And I'm not going to belabor the point. I think everyone is well aware in our society today the issues that come with identity theft and the issues that the victims have when they are, in fact, subjected to that.

One of the things that I would like to begin with,

Your Honor, is that as I was preparing for the sentencing

today, I looked on the internet, because there was these

references to the videos that he posted. I was, frankly,

shocked to see they were still there. They're still up on the

web.

2.4

And I looked at one of them called "Scamming is like Art" video, which is very professionally done. It's in an interview setting where the defendant is sitting in an interview with an individual who, apparently, interviews rappers or people. It was very professionally done. I was impressed with the quality of the video. I was not as impressed with the subject matter of the video which was, essentially, him explaining how it is that he makes his money. And bragging --

THE COURT: How he makes his money through credit card fraud.

MR. HATLEM: Through credit card swiping. It was not about his rapping. It was primarily almost exclusively about scamming. And almost, within the first 30 seconds, 45 seconds in this interview, the interviewer confronts him with, "How is it that you're talking about this? How are you openly talking about this? Aren't you concerned about some day facing some sort of justice?"

And his response is -- specifically, he was asked if he was concerned about being indicted. And he just chuckles and says that he is way smarter than those people. And then he goes on to talk about what he calls the art. And he describes it, in fact, as an art. And at one point refers to himself as Osama Bin Scammer.

The Court knows all this from the sentencing 1 2 memorandum. THE COURT: Right. 3 MR. HATLEM: I bring this point home to the Court 4 because there were 90,000 views of that video. It's a pretty 5 substantial number to my mind for what I would consider to be a 6 7 fairly unintelligible or unintelligent topic heading for 8 someone to have 90,000 people viewing that. And then I looked at after the indictment his 9 10 behaviors. And I saw that he has released an album in 11 September of last year, 2019. And he titles it "The United States versus Self-Made Cash." 12 THE COURT: He also has "United States versus Jonathan 13 Woods." 14 MR. HATLEM: I did not know that. I did not see that 15 16 one. THE COURT: Okay. That's okay. 17 MR. HATLEM: And in that there's some caricatures and 18 one of them appears to be this courtroom. 19 20 THE COURT: It does. 21 MR. HATLEM: And Your Honor's in it and Mr. Haugabook and there's a goat at defense counsel table sitting next to 22 23 him. 2.4 MR. HATLEM: I say these things --25 I don't know that Ms. Webster is in it. THE COURT:

MR. HATLEM: She's not.

2.4

THE COURT: I'm sorry, Ms. Webster.

MR. HATLEM: Ms. Webster is not in it.

THE COURT: I think the rest of us are in it.

MR. HATLEM: Yes. And so I say these things because I'm not sure that even at this late stage that he understands what he did. And coming from a state court prosecutor position for many years, when I first looked at this case, I will freely admit that when I was first asked to look at it, I saw it and I thought, well, this is a nonviolent offense. I looked at the guidelines. I saw what they were.

But I realize why now it has been charged and indicted as a federal offense. And that is because of his behaviors in encouraging and really -- I wouldn't say inciting, that's too strong a word but engaging in people to permit this offense.

We know he succeeded in doing that in the sense that people did direct message him and he gave them some information. It turned out to be faulty information because he's not as fluent in this crime as he could have been, thankfully.

But, clearly, he had an impact on some people through his social media presence. But I would ask the Court to consider the fact that of just those 90,000 people in that one video, how many other people he could very well have influenced and very well may have influenced who just didn't both to direct message him. But they were able to see the lifestyle

that he fronted, the large amounts of cash that he had. All of the things which he put out to world to say, "Hey, look this is a great way to make easy money and look at me, I'm doing it and I can teach you how to do it."

And I found that to be pretty upsetting, as I'm sure that the Court did as well. To our mind this case is a very strong case for deterrence. We are very concerned that a sentence that does not involve incarceration for this defendant, a term of imprisonment, would send the wrong message, not only to him. But broadly to the fact that there is a following of his.

This case has been picked up in the press, which is not the Court's concern, I understand that, but as I was reading through it I did see that there has been people following this case because of his status, the status he created for himself. Our position is that he deserves a term of incarceration, not only to subject him to a penalty for his behaviors in this case, subjecting the people who I would consider the true victims, the 16 people who were in the packet. I'm much less concerned about the people who reached out to him that he scammed who were trying to learn how to become credit card scammers. Those people are in a different category. But certainly, I am concerned about those people.

So there's a penalty aspect to this, but then there is more importantly, to our mind, a deterrence aspect to it. And

2.4

I understand the reality of his life, it has been difficult. I read through the sentencing memoranda that the defense has filed. I had already, obviously, the sentencing report. It's clear that he has faced some significant challenges in his lifetime. But I would also suggest to the Court that he has been given some opportunities. I look back to when he was 16, which is 10 years ago, which in the lifetime of a 16 year old to 26 year old is an unbelievable breadth of time and I'm not suggesting he is the same person he is today when he was 16. When he was 16, he had a firearm and he shot another child at a school.

He was put in intensive inpatient counseling. It's as strict punishment as you can give a juvenile offender in the State of Michigan and then he was released through the Star Commonwealth, which I know is a wonderful program. So he was given -- I would suggest to the Court, without knowing firsthand, I would suggest he was probably given quite a few tools during that period of time, which he could have used more constructively than he has moving forward. So I would suggest that there has been at least a component of his previous sentences where he has been given an opportunity to reform his behavior and as of today's date he has not yet done that.

So it really brings us to where we are today. The government is requesting a 28-month sentence in this case which is, to our mind, a fair sentence because not -- and again, I

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

```
did read -- like I said, I'll briefly just sum this up.
appalled and I was angry at the videos, but as I read through
his prior history and I saw the issues and difficulties he had,
I did come away from it with an understanding. That's why
we're not asking for the top of the guideline, but I would
suggest in this particular case it would send the wrong message
to this defendant, who is still going to be a young man even if
the Court adopts our recommendation, he will still be under 30
years of age, have his entire life ahead of him and hopefully
this will be the check that he needs to be a more fruitful
member of our society after this. It will be the deterrent
that he really needs to get his life on track.
         So unless there's any questions that the Court has,
that is the government's position and that is our request in
this case.
         THE COURT: No. I don't have any questions.
                                                        Thank
you very much.
         MS. WEBSTER: Your Honor, may we approach the side
bar.
         THE COURT:
                    Certainly. Off the record on this side.
         MS. WEBSTER: Please, Your Honor.
         THE COURT:
                     Sure.
     (Off the record discussion held at the bench.)
         THE COURT: Ms. Webster, do you want to consult with
your client briefly about our conversation and then ...
```

1 MS. WEBSTER: Sure. Thank you. (Consult with client.) 2 MS. WEBSTER: Thank you, Your Honor. May we come to 3 the podium as well? 4 THE COURT: Yes. 5 MS. WEBSTER: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor. 6 7 May I proceed? 8 THE COURT: Yes. 9 MS. WEBSTER: Thank you, Your Honor. Your Honor, I 10 have some initial commentary about this case in that my client 11 is a rapper. And in preparing for my sentence I read up on hip 12 hop lyrics and how the U.S. government likes to use those to prosecute folks. There's a huge article regarding a rapper out 13 of New York who just got a sentence in the Southern District of 14 And I read an article on a professor that talks 15 New York. 16 about how hip hop lyrics are the only genre used by the prosecution so far she could find to use against defendants 17 when they're using some of their intellectual creativity. 18 those are just kind of my general commentary to begin with. 19 20 But my client, I do believe that going on the 21 internet, which is what he did, Googling information from an 22 open source. Admittedly, he did go to tour at some points. 23 But this is all information that is open to anyone who seeks to 2.4 find it. And so at its core, you have a young man who is 25 seeking to escape through his music. He wants to be viewed as

```
an authentic rapper. He wants to be viewed authentically about
 1
    what he's rapping about, which in this case is credit card
 2
    fraud.
 3
              Now, I'm not passing judgment on that topic, but I do
 4
    think that a lot of what he was doing was well within his First
 5
    Amendment rights. And clearly, though, the line was crossed
 6
 7
    when individuals who liked his music were seeking to learn this
 8
    art of credit card fraud. I believe the government used the
    term art or my client when referencing his music, the art. And
 9
    really at its core that's what it was. It was an art that he
10
11
    was using the internet for to gain information and to be
12
    believed. So that people would go and buy his music.
              Mr. Hardy, the pretrial services officer, noted that
13
    he has --
14
              THE COURT: Was it to buy the music or to wire him
15
    five or $600 to purchase those starter packs?
16
17
              MS. WEBSTER: I think there was a mixed bag.
18
              THE COURT: Okay.
                            People who really liked it and people
19
              MS. WEBSTER:
20
    who were then moved beyond just liking it and wanting to try to
21
    do it.
              THE COURT: Um-hmm.
22
23
              MS. WEBSTER: He has music on Google, Apple Music.
2.4
    And I believe TuneCore. So it's not as though he's -- I mean,
25
    there's a legitimate musical talent there.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

What's different for me in this fraud case is typically you see someone who is getting the credit cards or selling them and seeking people out to convince them to engage in their fraud. These listeners sought out my client. contacted him. THE COURT: But doesn't the Instagram say DM, direct message me if you want to purchase this. MS. WEBSTER: Yes, Your Honor. But still he was not -- in my view at least he was not singling out individuals. People were free to ignore that, but there were people who sought him out. THE COURT: Okay. MS. WEBSTER: And so I --THE DEFENDANT: That page wasn't mine. THE COURT: You'll have a chance to speak, Mr. Woods. THE DEFENDANT: It's people that make hundreds of pages of saying my name, Selfmade Kash, who would try to do the same -- would do that same thing. I never posted on Twitter saying DM me for -- I never even promoted it. I never promoted it, you know. THE COURT: All right. Well, let's let Ms. Webster finish and then I'll turn to you. You'll have a chance to speak. MS. WEBSTER: So, Your Honor, what I am trying to say, perhaps, less inartfully, is I view this as a First Amendment

2.4

right to express, to explore, to research, to sing and it went over the line. And in terms of how far it went over the line, this isn't a case where you hear lyrics about, you know, snitches and ditches and things like that that we typically are focused on when we are dealing with the hip hop culture.

I looked at those videos or those postings and was not taken aback at all. It's the hip hop culture. I mean, it's been going on for years. Videos, rap videos, it's all about money. It's all about, you know, this party life. So he's 26 years old and was 24 or 23 at the time and it's, to me, not out of the ordinary for a young individual like him to be posturing like that for music, musical purposes and expression purposes.

So it isn't a small amount of fraud, relatively speaking. I mean, the guideline lost amount I believe, when I looked, goes up to 550 million dollars.

THE COURT: Right.

MS. WEBSTER: So when you're looking at that scale, he's low on the totem pole. I shouldn't have said that. He's low on the bottom rung of the --

THE COURT: I appreciate that.

MS. WEBSTER: And so in looking at the nature of the offense, Your Honor, I would like the Court to consider that. I did go into detail about his trauma and what is it like to walk around at 15 having witnessed what he witnessed without any mental health treatment. I just can't imagine just trying

2.4

to get up and go on ordinarily after having witnessed a murder.

And then taking the very courageous step of testifying in court, when we're all very familiar with the dangers of doing that. This anti-snitch culture, this don't say anything, keep it to yourself. That impact on a 15-year-old and how it's continued to impact him through his anxiety has been tremendous on him.

I think it's pretty clear on some of the behavior, the 16-year-old incident he incurred with the shooting. I do want to clarify it wasn't another kid he shot. It was a 23-year-old man. He was fighting a kid. That kid went to get the older brother and that's how the incident went down. It's certainly not trying to minimize it, just clarifying the facts.

Your Honor, and then I talked about the loss of his brother. And I don't want to belabor that. He does have his family here, his mother, his father, his brother and I don't think it's necessary to continue, but it's just loss after loss. You're aware of his recent loss with his girlfriend.

THE COURT: Yes.

MS. WEBSTER: Two losses. So I think, Your Honor, a sentence of incarceration would not be good for him in terms of growing beyond what he's -- what he needs to do. Because the treatment he's getting in the community would be better than inside based on his mental health issues.

Especially the anxiety. Especially -- I'm in the

2.4

exaggerating when I say, Your Honor, we get letters from clients after they're incarcerated where you have to prove that you had no parts in telling on anyone else, getting PSRs into the prison, even though they're prohibited, they make it in and people have to turn themselves in to solitary confinement to do their time if you're viewed as someone who has snitched.

And though this relates back to him being 15, he's terrified about that. And even when he's out, fears that someone's going to recognize him. So when we're looking at this case in its entirety, the relative low amount of fraud kind of counter balanced with the mental health issues and what it would mean to go into -- excuse me, the Bureau of Prisons, I really am imploring the Court to give him a chance to remain on the outside for his treatment.

If the Court were to give him probation, the Court still has the full statutory max available to incarcerate him if he does not do what he's supposed to do outside in the community. I think the alternative request would be a halfway house if the Court wants to further restrict his liberties, but at this point we would respectfully request a probationary sentence with whatever conditions the Court deems necessary.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Webster.

Mr. Woods, you have an opportunity to speak if you wish to do so, but you're not required to do so.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am. Good morning.

THE COURT: Good morning.

2.4

THE DEFENDANT: I first wanted to say that anything that I did, I took responsibility for as a man. If I didn't do it, I don't take responsibility for it. Everything I did, I took responsibility for it. I really don't remember most of the stuff that the prosecutor just said. But, honestly, I didn't fight the case that I went through when I shot the guy. I pleaded. I took the time and through that I was still dealing with the guy that had the murder case. When I was locked up, I had no outlets to rehabilitate because I was so worried about my life. I had no way to try to think how would I develop my mind if I'm worried about trying to survive. So, yeah, I fell through the programs that I was in when I was incarcerated. I couldn't concentrate, honestly.

And, okay, yeah, right now I really don't know that -- I take responsibility for what I did. I didn't see it as being any wrong when I was rapping about it. Everything led to the series of events. I just was rapping and it led to people asking me and it led to me going to the internet and trying to find more information.

And it also had me thinking about ifs, what ifs, what ifs. And I wrote a poem about ifs. The agony of if. Agony is pain, trauma, anguish. And I wrote a poem and I just wanted to share it with you real fast.

THE COURT: Sure.

```
THE DEFENDANT: It was "The Agony of If."
 1
              If is a word I have learned to despise.
 2
              If is a word that brings tears to my eyes.
 3
              I feel like I'm caught between walls of a stone cold
 4
    cell.
 5
              I relive my life and on If I dwell.
 6
 7
              I rest alone with If, night and day.
 8
              Wanting to change the past but finding no way.
              In the past if I had been wiser than such a fool.
 9
10
              I could have harnessed If and used it as a tool.
11
              Sometimes I think if one of y'all had a better life
    back then.
12
              I wouldn't be praying for the mercy of men.
13
              Yes, If is a word I could forget.
14
              But, ma'am, it only reminds me of all I regret
15
16
              The Agony of If.
              Thank you.
17
              THE COURT: Thank you, very much.
18
              Is there anything further?
19
20
              MS. WEBSTER: No. Thank you.
21
              THE COURT: Please be seated.
22
              THE COURT: I'll now turn to the imposition of the
23
              I'm required by law, 18 U.S.C. code, Section 3553 to
2.4
    fashion a sentence that is sufficient but not greater than
25
    necessary to achieve the statutory objectives of sentencing.
```

2.4

So I'll go through each of the objectives that are set forth in the law and discuss how I think they apply in your case.

Section A one requires that I look at the nature and circumstances of the offense and your personal history and characteristics. And I agree with Mr. Hatlem that it's a serious offense. Anytime someone's personal identifying information is used in furtherance of a criminal offense, there's lasting harm to the individual. It's a good thing here that you were not especially skilled at transmitting this personal identifying information. But when it is transmitted successfully, it can take years to undo credit reports that reveal items that should not be there. It can make the difference between getting a line of credit, a credit card and even the ability to get a car loan or a home loan.

I agree with Judge Roberts as she set forth in the case that Mr. Haugabook and the prosecutor cited that there is an epidemic of data breaches in our country. And what I understand, that leads to a treasure trove of data on the dark web where you went to purchase these 16 individuals' data that was used in this case.

I'm thankful that that was the extent of it. That it wasn't actually -- their credit reports were not harmed and they weren't faced with collection officers and so on. But the idea behind what you're attempting to do is serious. So I believe it's a serious offense.

2.4

Turning to your history and characteristics,

Mr. Woods, you have faced trauma and challenges that no child

or young adult should have to suffer through. As a very young

person I understand your mother was in an accident and was

unable to care for you and your siblings. And on two different

occasions you were placed in foster case for approximately a

year.

And that's a system we know is deeply flawed and can have a lasting and often negative impact on children who are placed within it. There's the issue of separation from your family. The impermanent nature of foster care, the disruption of your education and medical care and so much more. And in this case it happened more than once.

Then I saw that at age 15, as was referenced earlier, you witnessed a murder, saw somebody die a violent death in front of your eyes and you took the brave step of testifying in open court about that crime and have faced anxiety and fear of retaliation ever since. I commend you for your testimony and for assisting in bringing that particular case to justice, as hard as that must have been.

Following that experience, you were diagnosed with serious mental health challenges that required hospitalization and apparently led to your involvement with the juvenile offenses that are listed.

And then at age 22 your own brother was murdered.

2.4

And to the family that is here, I'm terribly sorry to learn of that.

So as I look through paragraph after paragraph of the presentence report, you faced trauma and losses that can alter the way that our brains function and can lead somebody who is faced with what you faced into a constant state of fight or flight, lack of sleep, inability to care for yourself the way you would be able to if you had not gone through those experiences.

And I understand you have a gunshot wound of your own that you carry with you and it serves as a contact reminder of the danger that exists in your life. So I look at your personal history and characteristics and I think that they weigh heavily in this particular case.

Section (a) (2(A) of the law requires that I fashion a sentence that will reflect the seriousness of the offense, promote respect for the law and provide just punishment. And I want to break that down. I do think this is a serious offense. The question is what is the appropriate consequence for that. In terms of promoting respect for the law, I turn that back to you. It will be -- no matter what the sentence is, it will be in your hands whether you choose to try to engage in this crime or any other crime again in the future.

So I ask of you that you take this opportunity, all that you have been through with this case, to take a different

2.4

approach when considering violating the criminal code.

Section (a) (2) (B) and (C), these are the hard ones here, because those require me to fashion a sentence that will provided adequate deterrence to criminal conduct that others might consider and, specifically, to protect the public from further crimes that you would contemplate or undertake.

And I think this is a tough case in that regard, because you have quite a social media following. And so you have people who are very interested in knowing whether there is a consequence for credit card fraud. And so I just say that in some ways that makes it harder, rather than easier, though I agree with Ms. Webster that your social media presence or any other media attention to this is not my business, in a sense, but I'll have more to say about that in a moment. But suffice it to say that I have given a great deal of thought about deterrence in this case.

Section (a)(2)(D) requires that I consider any needed educational or vocational training, medical care and other correctional treatment.

I understand you, from our last hearing together, are on a number of very strong medications that I have a letter dated today from Mr. Hardy, your pretrial services officer, indicating that you have followed up and attended the therapy and mental health treatment in at least two occasions in December and January since we were last in a hearing together.

2.4

So I'm required to look at the kinds of sentences that are available and avoid unwarranted sentencing disparities among defendants with similar records found guilty of similar conduct.

The sentencing guidelines are the place to begin that endeavor and that effort, but they're not the end of that process. Because I am required to look at you as an individual and not just as a number in the system.

So in light of that -- and I wanted to mention something else. Mr. Hatlem mentioned that this is not a violent offense and so on. I take fraud cases very seriously. And often there's an odd way in which I can almost understand how certain violent offenses take place in the heat of the moment. This is a situation that repeated itself over and over. So the fact that it's nonviolent doesn't have as big an impact perhaps on my thought process than it might otherwise.

So in light of that and pursuant to the Sentencing Reform Act 1984, having considered the guidelines and factors in 18 U.S. Code, Section 3553(a), I hereby sentence you to a term of 36 months of probation and that's on each count to run concurrently, meaning at the same time.

So, Mr. Woods, I'm talking to you and you alone. You caught a break here. You caught that break for the reasons that I have just set forth, which is that I think that your personal history and characteristics require that you receive

2.4

care more than you receive punishment. So you will have a requirement during those three years of probation that you engage, among other things, in 200 hours of community service. So you are sentenced to 200 hours of voluntary work to assist the community that you've have harmed.

But also there'll be a whole list of things that you're required to do. And what I want to make sure is clear to you, if you violate your term of probation, I have available to me to sentence you to the stat — to what you can be sentenced to. You can go to prison in this case and you will go to prison in this case if you violate the terms of your probation.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: Okay. Now, I also understand that you would like to reside in the Northern District of Ohio. Are you still interested in that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: I'm going to tell you something about those judges. If your supervision is transferred, I don't whether you'll reside there and I'll handle the supervision. I told you you caught a break. You're not going to catch another break. So understand me when I say from my eyes and my heart to yours, you have to live by the conditions I'm going to set forth. So I will include in the judgment that you may reside

in the Northern District of Ohio.

2.4

You will be ordered to pay a special assessment ot \$500. That's mandatory. It's \$100 per count of conviction. And that's due immediately.

You -- I will waive -- you do not have to pay a fine or the costs of supervision due to your lack of financial resources. Mandatory drug testing will be ordered. And I want to add here, Mr. Woods, that over the course of your pretrial supervision, you had 12 positive tests for marijuana and two positive screens for cocaine.

And whether marijuana is recreational or medical or whatever it is, you have had challenges with medication. And mixing the powerful medications that you're on with marijuana or cocaine or anything else can be very dangerous. So you will be required to have mandatory drug testing during this three-year period. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: Okay. Also, pursuant to law, 34 U.S. Code Section 40702, you're required to cooperate with the collection of a DNA sample as directed by probation. I'm also including as part of the judgment that you not have any further discussion of credit card fraud or illegal activity on the internet. And I don't think that that's a First Amendment violation. Because when you have used the internet to further your crime, it's fair and just and reasonable to -- for the

2.4

Court to determine that can't continue. So what I'm telling you, is you cannot use the internet to further credit card fraud or any other illegal activity.

While on supervision -- while on probation, you will be required to abide by the standard conditions adopted in the Eastern District of Michigan -- or the Northern District of Ohio, if your supervision is transferred -- and the following special conditions: Due to your prior substance abuse, mental health and so on, I am ordering that you participate in a substance abuse treatment program and follow the rules and regulations of that program. The probation officer in consultation with the treatment provider will supervise your participation in such a program, if necessary. And they'll work with you and your provider to determine if that's necessary. And that program may have its own testing, but that you still would have to do drug testing with probation.

I'm also requiring that you submit to a psychological or psychiatric evaluation as directed by probation, if necessary. And take all of the mental health medications if they are prescribed by your treating physician.

And I think you currently have quite a list of medications you're prescribed.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: You're also required to participate in ongoing mental health treatment and follow all the rules and

regulations of that treatment. And the probation officer will 1 2 work with you regarding what ongoing treatment is necessary. 3 Let me ask whether you're interested in any further formal education? Classroom? Degree? 4 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am. Everything, actually, 5 that you spoke on is -- that happen in the community is things 6 7 that I have always been interested in, it's just not having the 8 resources or, you know, like the people to go with me to do it. So I'm actually happy about that. 9 THE COURT: Good. 10 11 THE DEFENDANT: And it wouldn't be a problem, ma'am, 12 with me furthering my education because those are things that I didn't take advantage of when I was younger and I would like to 13 take advantage of now. 14 THE COURT: You went up through the 10th grade, right? 15 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am. 16 17 THE COURT: And do you want to get a GED? 18 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am. I don't pass judgment if you say you want 19 THE COURT: 20 to do something else, a vocational program or anything at all, 21 I just want to know. Because I don't want to put a condition 22 in here that either doesn't help you or sets you up for 23 failure. THE DEFENDANT: Honestly, I'm not familiar with when 2.4 25 you said vocational. So I don't know.

1 THE COURT: You've done home -- you've assisted family 2 members in the past? 3 THE DEFENDANT: Yeah. Yeah. So you mean like that. Like working and stuff. 4 THE COURT: Yeah, like carpentry or welding or any of 5 those sorts of things. 6 7 THE DEFENDANT: I would think, you know, furthering my 8 education with --9 THE COURT: Yeah. I think it would be really helpful to you in terms of everything. So I will put that you are 10 11 required to participate in an educational program and follow 12 that program's rules and regulations. It might be a high school GED. There are many other kinds of programs that -- so 13 I will put that you'll do that in consultation with the 14 probation officer so that the two of you can work out what will 15 be most helpful or interesting to you. 16 17 I'm also ordering that you participate in cognitive behavioral therapy treatment program, which could follow the 18 psychiatric evaluation. And the probation officer would 19 20 supervise your participation in that program. 21 Is the government seeking restitution? MR. HATLEM: I don't believe that there is any 22 23 restitution owing, Your Honor. 2.4 Yeah. I don't think so. I mean, these people were ripped off of their five or six hundred dollars, 25

2.4

but they were trying to engage in a crime. So you're not trying to return that?

MR. HATLEM: No. I guess he gets to enjoy the proceeds of that, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Well, that will constitute your sentence in this case.

And Mr. Woods, I fashioned the sentence based on what I have learned about you through the three hearings that we have now had, your forthright conversation with me at the last hearing, the violation of your conditions of pretrial release. And I take all of those conditions very seriously and I know that you will as well.

In your guilty plea, you waived or gave up your right to appeal your sentence as long as I sentenced you in accordance with the way your sentence was estimated. I sentenced you below that. But if you or your lawyer believe you do have a right or an issue to appeal in your sentence, you must do so within 14 days of entry of the judgment and you can request a lawyer be appointed to assist you with that if you don't have the money to pay for one.

Mr. Hatlem, are there any counts that need to be dismissed? Isn't there a sixth count?

MR. HATLEM: It was a Count Six, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. So I would grant the government's motion to dismiss that.

```
1
              MR. HATLEM: We would move to dismiss that, Your
 2
            Thank you.
    Honor.
              THE COURT: So does either the government or
 3
    Ms. Webster or Mr. Woods have any objection to the sentence
 4
    that has just been pronounced?
 5
              MR. HATLEM: We would object to the sentence, Your
 6
 7
    Honor.
 8
              THE COURT: Okay.
              MS. WEBSTER: Your Honor, no objections.
 9
              THE COURT: Well, Mr. Woods, I wish you the best and I
10
11
    don't want to see you back here.
12
              THE DEFENDANT: Ma'am, thank you for the opportunity.
    I will take advantage of the opportunity and not the person
13
    that gave it to me.
                         Thank you.
14
              THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
15
16
              MS. WEBSTER: Your Honor, I think Mr. Woods had a
    question about the internet. He can still make --
17
              THE COURT: You can make music. That's how you make
18
    your money. You can't promote a crime on the internet.
19
20
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
21
              THE COURT: Because you are now convicted. You have a
22
    felony conviction here, several of them. And so there are
23
    restrictions that can flow from having committed a crime and
2.4
    the restriction that I'm -- you couldn't do this -- well, maybe
25
    you could. I don't know.
```

But as a consequence of the way you did this crime, you can't promote crime on the internet of credit -- credit card fraud is what I'm concerned about.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am. And I understand. I just couldn't read between the lines of, like, I just got to stop rapping period?

THE COURT: No. Nope.

2.4

THE DEFENDANT: Okay. I understood.

THE COURT: And I think Ms. Webster makes a very good point that a great deal of country music talks about crime and we don't see people bringing in country music lyrics.

So I have another case where I'm facing a motion to introduce rap lyrics as evidence of a crime. So this is an issue in the criminal justice system that's important and worth paying attention to. But here you actually did this crime through your -- these songs and so on. So that's what you can't do, is anymore -- promoting anymore credit card fraud through the internet.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: Mr. Hatlem?

MR. HATLEM: Thank you, Your Honor. Would the Court, then, include in that order that he has to take down videos that he has continuously posted and are still up that promote credit card fraud, because otherwise I think that the Court's order is somewhat without meaning seeing as how he's still

```
getting views and garnering views on those that are explicitly
 1
    explaining how to commit credit card fraud and glorifying it.
 2
              I don't believe it's a First Amendment issue, Your
 3
    Honor, if that is what the Court is concerned about. Because
 4
    as a YouTube member, he generates revenue off of that.
 5
    making money off of these still. So I don't see the issue with
 6
 7
    it if the Court is going to go to the extent -- which I
 8
    wholeheartedly --
                         See I don't know whether those are the
 9
              THE COURT:
    videos that actually furthered this crime or not.
10
11
              MR. HATLEM: Well, they're on the internet and they
    talk --
12
              THE COURT: "U.S. versus Selfmade Kash", I listened to
13
    that.
14
              MR. HATLEM: Well, that isn't my point. I'm talking
15
16
    about the videos that he has posted up there with himself
    fanning out the $50,000. I mean, they're in our sentencing
17
    memorandum.
18
              THE COURT: Yeah.
19
                                 No. I saw that.
20
              Ms. Webster?
21
              MS. WEBSTER: Your Honor, I guess I would ask for an
    opportunity to take a look at all of the videos. I did not
22
23
    review all of them.
2.4
              THE COURT: I didn't review. I just reviewed your
25
    memo and a smattering of YouTube's.
```

```
MS. WEBSTER: Would the Court like a short position on
 1
    whether or not that should be a condition after I had an
 2
 3
    opportunity to look at them?
              THE COURT: That would be helpful?
 4
              So why don't we ...
 5
              I'm going to look at the calendar.
 6
 7
         (Pause.)
 8
              MR. HATLEM: Your Honor, if the Court isn't inclined
 9
    to grant it -- I mean, I don't want to seem angry about this,
10
    but ...
11
              THE COURT: No.
12
              MR. HATLEM: It seems like such a minimal request of a
    person who has just been given a huge break. We gave him a
13
    break by not imposing the mandatory consecutive sentence.
14
    court justifiably gave him a break. That's fine. But the idea
15
16
    that we're just asking him to take down videos of criminal
    behavior of him with guns and firearms and he's fighting about
17
    that is, frankly, ludicrous. But if the Court is --
18
              THE COURT: Well, he's not fighting. His lawyer is
19
20
    wanting to take a look at it. He hasn't said anything about
21
    it.
22
              And I have been giving the First Amendment thought
23
    from the minute this case showed up. So I'm not prepared to
2.4
    ask him to take things down that I haven't reviewed.
25
              MR. HATLEM: Okay, Your Honor.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

```
THE COURT: If the government does want to pursue
that -- and that's a reasonable request. I don't think it's
unreasonable.
         We could have briefing by the 31st of this month or
the -- two weeks is the 24th.
         MR. HATLEM: That's fine.
         MS. WEBSTER: That works, Your Honor.
         THE COURT: So we'll do the 31st. And what I would
like is links, Mr. Hatlem, to what you want taken down.
Because I don't want to issue an order and not know what is
coming down and what is not and then be unable to see if it was
abided by.
         MR. HATLEM: Yes, Your Honor.
         THE COURT:
                     So why don't we do this: By the 24th, the
government would identify what you think should be taken down
with just a short parenthetical. "This instructs people on how
to engage in credit card fraud and it was used in furtherance
of this crime."
         MR. HATLEM: And did you say the 24th?
         THE COURT: Yeah. And then Ms. Webster, can you
respond by the 31st?
         MS. WEBSTER: Yes, Your Honor.
         THE COURT: So I will not enter the judgment -- or I
could enter it and then have an amended judgment if I add that.
         Ms. Danish, which is best?
```

```
PRETRIAL SERVICES REPRESENTATIVE: The amendment.
                                                                   Ιf
1
 2
    he's looking to move or even provides provision, it's hard to
    do when a judgment is not expelled.
 3
              THE COURT: All right. So we'll enter judgment as
 4
 5
    soon as it's prepared and I'm going to amend it if I'm going to
    add this requirement.
 6
 7
              MR. HATLEM: Thank you, Your Honor.
 8
              MS WEBSTER: Thank you.
                          Thank you.
 9
              THE COURT:
10
              THE CLERK OF THE COURT: Court's in recess. All rise.
11
          (At 12:06 p.m., matter concluded.)
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATE

I, Darlene K. May, Official Court Reporter for the United States District Court, Eastern District of Michigan, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript, to the best of my ability, from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter. I further certify that the transcript fees and format comply with those prescribed by the Court and the Judicial Conference of the United States.

February 27, 2020 Date

/s/ Darlene K. May
Darlene K. May, CSR, RPR, CRR, RMR
Federal Official Court Reporter
Michigan License No. 6479